

1 **Title: Effects of COVID-19 on the provision of Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH)**
2 **services in health care facilities in the Far-North Region of Cameroon**
3 **Short Title: Effects of COVID-19 on the provision of WASH services in health care**
4 **facilities**

5
6 Carole Debora Nounkeu¹, Giequel Corniche Noubissi Massop², Donato Koyalta³,
7 Chanceline Bilounga Ndongo⁴, Florent Kamkumo Ouabo⁵, Bertin Nono⁶, Marie Nicole
8 Ngoufack⁷, Jigna Morarji Dharod⁸, Catherine Juillard⁹, Alain Chichom-Mefire¹⁰, Georges
9 Nguefack-Tsague*²

10

11

12 ¹Regional Delegation of Public Health Littoral, Douala, Cameroon

13 ²Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, University of Yaoundé 1, Yaoundé,
14 Cameroon

15

16 ³Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Human Health Sciences, University of Ndjamen,
17 Ndjamen, Tchad

18

19 ⁴Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Pharmaceutical Sciences, University
20 of Douala, Douala, Cameroon

21

22 ⁵Department of Mathematics, BTU Cottbus-Senftenberg, Germany

23 ⁶Delta Air Lines, 1030 Delta Boulevard Atlanta, GA 30354-6001 USA

24 ⁷Challenges Initiative Solutions, Yaoundé, Cameroon

25 ⁸Department of Nutrition, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, USA

26 ⁹Department of Surgery, University of California, San Francisco, California, USA

27 ¹⁰Department of Surgery, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Buea

28

29 *Corresponding author

30 Email: nguefacktsague@gmail.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

31 **Abstract**

32 Worldwide, the Joint Monitoring Program reports that one in four health care facilities
33 (HCFs) lack functional water supply on premises, one in three lack hand hygiene facilities, and
34 one in three lack adequate infectious waste disposal. The COVID-19 pandemics shed light on
35 the lack of investments, the absence of infrastructures, education and policies related to WASH
36 as well as revealed insufficient investment in healthcare safety and has brought WASH services
37 as non-negotiable for HCFs. This study used a cross-sectional pre-post COVID-19 framework
38 to determine the proportion of HCFs: meeting basic WASH services and, which WASH
39 services improved post-COVID-19 in the Far-North Region of Cameroon. A total of 97
40 (23.04%) HCFs among the 421 that are found in the Far-North region were surveyed and
41 located in eight (25%) of the 32 Health Districts. They corresponded to the integrated health
42 centers category (79.4%) and the survey's respondent was the chief of the HCF (92.8%).
43 Approximately 75.3%, 0.0%, 48.5%, 46.4%, and 6.2% of HCFs respectively met thresholds for
44 basic water, sanitation, hygiene, waste management, and environment cleaning services. When
45 comparing pre- vs. post COVID-19 periods, a significant increase (8%) was noted in the
46 proportion of HCFs as of optimal handwashing practices-related services ($P=0.0026$). There
47 was also a significant increase ($p=0.007$) in the proportion of HCFs with cleaning protocols
48 available. Further, none of the HCFs fulfilled all the criteria to meet basic services for all the
49 five WASH services. In conclusion, the response to the COVID-19 pandemics only partially
50 improved WASH services-related infrastructures in HCFs of the Far-North Region of
51 Cameroon. The COVID-19 pandemics was a missed opportunity to strengthen WASH services.
52 There should be a continuing encouragement of governments and funding agencies in planning
53 and budgeting WASH in healthcare-related research and issues, and enabling the maintenance
54 of existing WASH infrastructures in healthcare settings.

55

56 **Introduction**

57 Health care facilities (HCFs) are recognized and defined by the World Health
58 Organization (WHO) as “environments with a high prevalence of infectious disease agents
59 where patients, staff, caregivers and neighbors of the health-care setting face unacceptable risks
60 of infection if environmental health is inadequate.” They require infrastructures that support
61 water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) as well as healthcare waste management practices, in
62 order to prevent the spread of disease not only within the HCF, but also to the surrounding
63 community, ensuring quality of care and patients’ safety [1,2]. WASH in HCFs refers to safe
64 and accessible water supply, clean and safe sanitation facilities, hand hygiene facilities at points
65 of care and at toilets, and appropriate waste disposal systems [2,3]. The WHO and the United
66 Nations International Children Emergency Fund (UNICEF) joint monitoring program (JMP)
67 has developed a set of harmonized indicators for WASH in HCFs, corresponding to service
68 levels—basic, limited, and no service—that are used, both to describe the proportion of HCFs,
69 which receive different services, and to report progressive improvements [4]. A “basic” level
70 of WASH services corresponds to the minimum combination of WASH services required to
71 protect patients and staff’s health [5].

72 Subsequently, worldwide, the JMP reports that one in four HCFs lack functional water
73 supply on premises, one in three lack hand hygiene facilities, and one in three lack adequate
74 infectious waste disposal [6]. Insufficient piped water on the HCF premises limits handwashing,
75 performing of safe surgeries or deliveries, and cleaning, leading to an increase prevalence of
76 health care acquired infections, which are two to twenty times more prevalent in low-and
77 middle-income countries than in developed ones [4,7]. The situation is even worse in resource
78 limited settings with 50%, 63%, >25%, and 70% of HCFs lacking access to piped water,
79 sanitation facilities, hand hygiene facilities, and appropriate waste disposal systems
80 respectively and considering the detrimental effects of seasonal water shortages, non-functional

81 water infrastructure, and fluctuating water quality commonly experienced there [2,6,8]. In fact,
82 an evaluation of representative data from six countries revealed that only 2% of HCFs provided
83 all four of the required service—water, sanitation, hygiene, and waste disposal [4].

84 According to the Ministry of Public Health, in Cameroon, a low middle income country
85 of sub-Saharan Africa experiencing economic water scarcity, mortality related to poor WASH
86 practices is estimated at 45.2 deaths per 100 000 inhabitants [9]. In addition to that, in the last
87 decade, Cameroon has experienced several waves of cholera epidemics with the northern and
88 costal zones of the country being the main foci. Especially, the Littoral Region includes the
89 most affected urban districts while the Far-North Region includes the most affected rural
90 districts at the national level [10]. In 2014, the Ebola epidemic in West Africa highlighted the
91 deathful consequences of the lack of hand washing facilities as a first line of defense for health
92 care professionals [11]. Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemics shed light on the lack of
93 investments, the absence of infrastructures, education and policies related to WASH as well as
94 revealed insufficient investment in health care safety and has brought WASH services as non-
95 negotiable for HCFs [6,8].

96 During the 2019 World Health Assembly, the resolution on WASH in HCFs was
97 unanimously adopted by members of state of the WHO [8]. Furthermore, the COVID-19
98 pandemics constrained a reassessment of existing norms in national health systems,
99 emphasizing the critical role of adequate WASH practices in protecting human health
100 throughout infectious disease epidemics, ensuring continuity of essential services, and outlining
101 the need to implement country level policies that would prioritize this essential aspect of
102 healthcare delivery. The 2020 global progress report on WASH in HCFs highlighted major gaps
103 in provision of basic hygiene, sanitation, and water services, hence pointing to the critical need
104 to strengthen national surveillance by integrating WASH indicators and obtain a reliable and
105 representative baseline of WASH conditions in each country [5]. Better data monitoring will

106 help to identify low coverage facilities as well as low-cost solutions to improve the situation.
107 The global targets suggest that 80% of HCFs should meet basic WASH services requirement
108 before 2025 [6]. This study aims to assess the effects of the COVID-19 pandemics on WASH
109 in HCFs of the Far-North Region of Cameroon. Specifically, to determine the proportion of
110 HCFs: (1) meeting basic WASH services, and (2) which, WASH services improved post-
111 COVID-19 in the Far-North Region of Cameroon.

112

113 **Materials and Methods**

114 **Study Area**

115 The Far-North Region is one of the 10 regions of Cameroon, bordering the North Region to
116 the south, Chad to the east, and Nigeria to the West. With a population of about 5 104 209
117 inhabitants in 2022, it is considered among the most populated regions of the country and as
118 well as the most densely populated. The region is divided into 32 Health Districts (HDs). The
119 different HDs include 303 Health Areas and about 421 HCFs. Because there is no
120 internationally accepted typology for HCFs, the classification is mostly country-dependent [4].
121 HCFs in Cameroon are either governmental or private and can be grouped into five categories,
122 which from the lowest to the highest include: (1) integrated health centers (IHC, headed by a
123 senior nurse) and (2) sub-divisional hospitals (CMA, with a physician among the staff); (3)
124 district hospitals, first reference hospital, which offer complimentary package of activities
125 compared to IHC and CMA; (4) Regional hospitals, in charge of specialized health care at the
126 level of the Region. The second and the first categories are represented by Central and General
127 hospitals that handle cases needing more specialized equipment and knowhow [10].

128

129 Study Design and Sampling

130 This was a cross sectional analytical study whose data collection took place from March
131 2nd, 2022 to June 28th, 2022 targeting HDs of the Far-North Cameroon. To obtain the minimum
132 sample size (n) of 91 HCFs to be visited, we used the Cochran's Modified Formula for Finite
133 Populations [12] :

$$134 \quad n = \frac{\frac{Z^2 \times P(1-P)}{d^2}}{1 + \frac{\frac{Z^2 \times P(1-P)}{d^2} - 1}{N}}$$

135 standard normal distribution =1.96, P is the proportion of adequately functioning WASH
136 services in HCFs=50% (default due to non-availability), d is the precision= 0.1, N=421 (total
137 number of HCFs in all the 32 HDs), and 15% non-response rate.

138 Due to research constraints, eight HDs: Maroua 1 (21 HCFs), Maroua 2 (17 HCFs),
139 Maroua 3 (17 HCFs), Kousseri (16 HCFs), Makary (08 HCFs), Goulfey (11 HCFs), Mada (13
140 HCFs) and Fotokol (02 HCFs) were conveniently selected, then proceeded to select all the
141 HCFs in each HD. One respondent per selected HCF was interviewed. From these HDs,
142 HCFs, which managers were absent during data collection, or which were not functional till
143 12 months pre-COVID-19, or which were located in difficultly accessible geographical areas
144 or areas with high level of insecurity were excluded from the study.

145 Data Collection

146 The study used a validated questionnaire including core indicators that addressed basic
147 WASH services in HCFs [13]. In addition to that, supplementary indicators were used to
148 describe general characteristics of HCFs and respondents and assess the efficacy of WASH
149 services in health care settings. Data collection involved direct observation and discussion with
150 respondents issued from the management team of each selected HCFs. A set of identical

151 questions were asked to obtain a picture of the situation before (12 months pre-COVID-19) and
152 after the COVID-19 pandemics. The survey guide included eight sections : (1) HCFs
153 characteristics (type, category, location, outpatient consultation-only centers); (2) respondents
154 characteristics (function, age, gender, grade); (3) water supply services (type of water source,
155 location of the water source, availability of water); (4) sanitation services (type of latrines,
156 availability of latrines, privacy of latrines, access to people with reduced mobility); (5) hygiene
157 services (availability of hand hygiene facilities at the points of care and near toilets); (6)
158 healthcare waste management services (safe segregation and treatment of wastes); (7)
159 environmental cleaning practices (availability of protocols for cleaning, training of staff with
160 cleaning responsibilities); and (8) other indicators: influence of electricity outages on water
161 availability, water treatment, latrines lightening, sufficient ventilation, gray water drainage,
162 availability of cleaning material, availability of protection equipment for the cleaning staff, and
163 availability of a laundry service [13,14].

164 **Data Analysis**

165 The data were entered in CSpro (Census and Survey Processing System) version 7.5 and
166 exported to IBM-SPSS version 20 and R version 4.3.0 for statistical analysis. As for descriptive
167 statistics, categorial variables were presented as numbers and percentages whereas numerical
168 variables were presented as means \pm standard deviation or median \pm interquartile range
169 depending on the distribution. Bivariate analysis was conducted using McNemar test. The
170 significance threshold for p-value was set as <0.05 .

171 Classification of WASH services and its five domains into their corresponding levels
172 per facility was done by calculating the proportion of HCFs providing basic service levels
173 following the JMP guideline [13]. A set of identical questions were asked to describe core
174 indicators frequency and proportions before (12 months pre-COVID-19) and after the COVID-

175 19 pandemics. Individual questions assessing the different indicators for each WASH service
176 i.e., water supply, sanitation, hygiene, waste management, and environmental cleaning were
177 compiled to create the WASH-HCF tool. Following team consensus and literature review based
178 on WASH-FIT and WASH-FAST tools interpretation [13,14], the WASH-HCF tool includes
179 exhaustive indicators of adequate WASH in HCFs. The score for each of the 39 indicators
180 included in the WASH-HCF tool was determined: 0- does not or partially meet the required
181 standards (i.e. target) and 1- fully meets the target. From this, we were able to create an
182 aggregate facility score that can be used to show facilities' global performance of WASH
183 services and be interpreted as follows: inadequate (total score=0-9), basic (total score=10-19),
184 intermediate (total score=20-29), advanced (total score=30-39). To examine whether the
185 WASH-HCF score differed between the pre- vs. post-COVID-19 period, the test for marginal
186 homogeneity as well as the exact tests of symmetry, including pairwise McNemar test were
187 conducted.

188 **Ethical Considerations**

189 Ethical clearance N° 3274 CEI-UDo/06/2022/T was obtained from the University of
190 Douala committee and authorizations submitted for approval to the Regional Delegation of
191 Public Health Far-North Region as well as to HCFs directors. Prior to the survey, each HCFs
192 chief received an information notice and a consent form. All Participants provided written
193 informed consent. Because this study can reveal sensitive information of HCFs, all the
194 information that could help identifying HCFs were removed.

195

196

197

198 Results

199 General characteristics of participants

200 A total of 97 (23.04%) HCFs among the 421 that are found in the Far-North region were
 201 surveyed for this study (**Table 1**). They were located in eight (25%) of the 32 HDs, were mainly
 202 from public management (80.4%), and corresponded in majority to the category of integrated
 203 health centers (79.4%). More than half (58.8%) of the HCFs were located in rural vs. urban
 204 areas and a similar proportion (55.7%) had a WASH focal point among the staff. The
 205 respondents, who were generally the chief of the HCF (92.8%) were mainly males (83.5%) and
 206 aged on average 41.18 ± 7.13 years old. The respondents' professional grades were either nurse
 207 (51.5%), assistant nurse (39.2%), or physicians (4.1%) and approximately two-thirds of the
 208 respondents had a professional experience of 10 years or less. Even though one-third of
 209 respondents were also WASH focal points, only 59% of them reported receiving a WASH-
 210 related training.

211 Table 1. General characteristics of HCFs and socio-demographic characteristics of
 212 respondents (n=97)

HCFs characteristics	Numbers(%)	Respondents' characteristics	Numbers(%)
District		Gender	
Kousseri	14(14.4)	Male	81(83.5)
Mada	13(13.4)	Female	16(16.5)
Makary	8(8.2)	Age (years)	
Fotokol	2(2.1)]25-35]	19(19.6)
Goulfey	11(11.3)]35-45]	47(48.5)
Maroua 1	18(18.6)]45-55]	27(27.8)
Maroua 2	16(16.5)]55-65]	4(4.1)
Maroua 3	15(15.5)	Position in the facility	
Type		Chief	90(92.8)
Public	78(80.4)	General Supervisor	7(7.2)
Private	12(12.4)	Grade	
Private confessional	7(7.2)	Medical Doctor	4(4.1)
Category		Nurse	50(51.5)
Integrated health centers	77(79.4)	Assistant nurse	38(39.2)
Sub-divisional hospitals	14(14.4)	Lab assistant	2(2.1)
District hospitals	4(4.1)	Pharmacy agent	3(3.1)
Regional hospital	2(2.1)	Years of experience	

Location		<10	67(69.1)
Urban area	40(41.2)	[10-20[25(25.8)
Rural Area	57(58.8)	[20-30[4(4.1)
Outpatient-only consultations	45(46.4)	≥30	1(1.0)
Absence of usable toilets (available, functional, private)	13(13.4)	The respondent is the	33(34.0)
Presence of a WASH focal point	54(55.7)	WASH focal point	
Presence of a funding agency	29(29.9)	The respondent received	57(58.8)
		a WASH training	

213

214

215 **Availability of WASH services in HCFs**

216 Although 95.9% of HCFs had improved water within 500 m of walking distance, only
 217 77.3% of these water sources were located on premises i.e., within the building or the facility
 218 grounds. As well, three-quarter of the HCFs in the study area provided basic water services
 219 (**Table 2**). Thirteen HCFs (13.4%) lacked toilets that were available, functional, and private.
 220 The median number of usable toilets was 2 (IQR: 2-4). Eighty to ninety percent of the visited
 221 HCFs lacked either toilets accessible for people with reduced mobility or for menstrual hygiene
 222 management. None of the HCFs met basic sanitation services criteria for healthcare, i.e., by
 223 definition, the proportion of HCFs with improved toilets which are usable, sex-separated,
 224 provide for menstrual hygiene management, separate for patients and staff, and accessible for
 225 people with limited mobility.

226 Approximately 85.6% of HCFs had functional hand hygiene facilities at points of care
 227 compared to 51.1% within 5 m of the toilets. Less than half (48.5%) of HCFs met basic levels
 228 for hygiene and handwashing services. A similar proportion of HCFs (46.4%) had waste
 229 correctly segregated in the consultation area and infectious and sharps waste safely
 230 treated/disposed. As for environmental cleaning services, even though 73.2% of HCFs had
 231 cleaning protocols that included step-by-step techniques for different cleaning tasks as well as
 232 a cleaning schedule specifying both the responsibilities and the frequency of those tasks, only
 233 6% of the staff responsible for cleaning had received any sort of training (Table 2).

234 Table 2. Calculating WASH in HCFs service levels based on responses to the core questions
235 (n=97)

Core Indicators	Pre-COVID-19 (%)	Post-COVID-19 (%)	Difference	P value
Water Supply Services				
Proportion of HCF with an improved water supply within 500 m	95.9	95.9	0.0	1.00
Proportion of HCF with an improved water supply on premises i.e., within the building or the facility grounds.	77.3	77.3	0.0	1.00
Proportion of HCF with an improved water supply with water available	88.7	91.8	0.0	0.248
Proportion of HCF with water available from an improved water supply located on premises (basic)	72.2	75.3	+3.1	0.248
Sanitation services				
Proportion of HCF with improved toilets	97.9	97.9	0.0	1.00
Proportion of HCF with improved toilets which are usable	86.6	86.6	0.0	1.00
Proportion of HCF with improved toilets which are sex-separated	58.8	57.7	-1.1	1.000
Proportion of HCF with improved toilets which include facilities for menstrual hygiene management	14.4	10.3	-4.1	0.133
Proportion of HCF with improved toilets which are dedicated for staff	62.9	64.9	+2.0	0.617
Proportion of HCF with improved toilets which are accessible for people with limited mobility	20.6	20.6	0.0	1.00
Proportion of HCF with improved toilets which are usable, sex-separated, provide for menstrual hygiene management, separate for patients and staff, and accessible for people with limited mobility (basic)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.00
Hygiene and handwashing services				
Proportion of HCF with hand hygiene facilities at points of care with water and soap and/or alcohol hand rub available	79.4	85.6	+6.2	0.041
Proportion of HCF with hand washing facilities within 5 meters of toilets with water and soap available	44.3	51.5	+7.2	0.045

Proportion of HCF with hand hygiene facilities at point of care with water and soap and/or alcohol hand rub available and hand washing facilities within 5 meters of the toilets with water and soap available (basic)	40.2	48.5	+8.3	0.026
Waste management services				
Proportion of HCF with waste correctly segregated in the consultation area	45.4	49.5	+4.1	0.288
Proportion of HCF with infectious waste safely treated/disposed	96.9	99.0	+2.1	0.479
Proportion of HCF with sharps waste safely treated/disposed	91.8	94.8	+3.0	0.248
Proportion of HCF with waste correctly segregated in the consultation area and infectious and sharps waste safely treated/disposed (basic)	41.2	46.4	+7.2	0.182
Environment cleaning services				
Proportion of HCF with cleaning protocols available	63.9	73.2	+9.3	0.007
Proportion of HCF where all staff responsible for cleaning have received training	5.2	6.2	+1.0	1.000
Proportion of HCF with cleaning protocols available and where all staff responsible for cleaning have received training (basic)	5.2	6.2	+1.0	1.000

236

237 **WASH service levels based on responses to core questions pre-and** 238 **post-COVID-19**

239 There was no significant change in the proportion of HCFs with improved water supply
240 either located on premises or within 500 m, 12 months pre-COVID-19 vs. the post-COVID-19
241 period. However, even though not statistically significant ($p=0.248$), there was an increase
242 ($\sim+3\%$) in the percentage of HCFs with basic water access (Table 2). As for sanitation services,
243 the proportion of improved toilets with special commodities (sex-separated, including facilities
244 for menstrual hygiene management) decreased, but the difference in pre- and post-COVID-19
245 proportions was not significant.

246 A significant increase was noted in the proportion of HCFs as of optimal handwashing
247 practices related services. Especially, an increase of 8% was noted in a basic hygiene service
248 prior to the COVID-19 pandemics compare to the post-COVID-19 period ($P=0.0026$). The
249 proportion of HCFs with correctly segregated waste passed from 45.36% to 49.48% pre- and
250 post-COVID-19 respectively. Also, there was an increase in the proportion of HCFs with basic
251 waste management services. But, the difference was not statistically significant. There was a
252 significant increase ($p=0.007$) in the proportion of HCFs with cleaning protocols available.
253 However, no significant difference was found in the percentage of HCFs with basic
254 environment cleaning services (Table 3).

255 When all five domains were considered together, none of the investigated HCFs fulfilled
256 all criteria to meet basic services. When excluding sanitation and environment cleaning
257 services, there was a 3% not significant increase pre- vs. post-COVID-19 periods. However,
258 when focusing on water and hygiene and handwashing domains, there was an 8% increase
259 between the proportion of HCFs meeting basic criteria for both services pre- and post-
260 COVID-19, with this difference being significant ($p=0.045$). On the other hand, the
261 proportion of HCFs, which did not meet basic levels for any of the five WASH services
262 decreased from 11.3% to 7.2% and the difference was not significant. The evolution of a HCF
263 before compared to after COVID-19 represented the independent variable and was measured
264 as the proportion of HCFs, which situation evolved in any of the WASH services basic levels.
265 This proportion for water, sanitation, hygiene, waste management, and environmental
266 cleaning was respectively 3.1%, 0.0%, 9.3%, 7.2%, 1% (Table 3). Overall, 13.4% of HCFs
267 evolved pre- to post-COVID-19 period.

268

269

270 Use of the WASH-HCF Tool

271 When assessing the differences in global WASH services using the WASH-HCF score for
 272 each HCF, the minimum score passed from 7 pre-COVID-19 to 10 post-COVID-19 and the
 273 mean score passed from 20.31±5.32 to 21.08±4.82. There was a significant change in the
 274 distribution of HCFs according to their global WASH service levels pre- vs. post-COVID-19
 275 (p<0.001). In addition to that, as shown in **Table 3**, all the two HCFs that showed inadequate
 276 global WASH services pre-COVID-19 evolved to basic (50%) and intermediate (50%) levels.
 277 Approximately 30% of HCFs, which showed basic global WASH services pre-COVID-19
 278 evolved to the intermediate level post-COVID-19 ((p=0.039). The majority of HCFs (88%)
 279 from the intermediate level as well as those from the advance level (100%) did not change
 280 their category pre vs. post-COVID-19. Only two HCFs, initially in the intermediate category,
 281 regressed to the basic level after the COVID-19 pandemics (Table 3). The evolution of the
 282 HCFs was also measured based on their WASH-HCF scores: there was 27.8% HCFs, which
 283 scores increased from pre- to post-COVID-19 period.

284 Table 3. Assessment of the differences in global WASH services pre- and post-COVID-19
 285 using the WASH-HCF tool scores (n=97).

		Post-COVID19					P	
		n (%)					value	
	Global WASH Services	Inadequate	Basic	Intermediate	Advanced	Total		
Pre-COVID-19	n (%)	Inadequate	0(0.0)	1(50.0)	1(50.0)	0(0.0)	2(2.1)	<0.001
	Basic	0(0.0)	30(69.8)	13(30.2)	0(0.0)	43(44.3)		
	Intermediate	0(0.0)	2(4.0)	44(88.0)	4(8.0)	50(51.5)	*0.039	
	Advanced	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(100.0)	2(2.1)		
	Total	0(0.0)	33(34.0)	58(59.7)*	6(6.1)	97(100.0)		

286
 287
 288
 289

290 Discussion

291 An increased access to WASH services in HCFs is needed in poor settings not only to
292 ensure staff and patient safety, but also to improve quality of care and strengthen global health
293 security [15]. In this study, the response to the COVID-19 pandemics partially improved
294 WASH services-related infrastructures in HCFs of the Far-North Region of Cameroon.
295 Especially, even though there was no significant difference in basic water and sanitation
296 services access, there was a significant increase in HCFs meeting basic hygiene services as
297 well as in the proportion of HCFs with cleaning protocols available.

298 A safe, adequate, and consistent access to water in HCFs is vital for reducing the
299 transmission and morbidity of infectious diseases [16]. In this study, 95.9% of HCFs had
300 improved water within 500 m of walking distance, 77.3% of these water sources were located
301 on premises. This is similar to the results of a study, which found that 88% of health facilities
302 across 18 countries in sub-Saharan Africa had improved water sources on premises between
303 2013-2018 [17]. However, it is very important to understand that the presence of water
304 sources does not always translate into regular access to patients and visitors [18]. Research on
305 household water insecurity has demonstrated that beyond objective indicators such as
306 presence/absence of improved water source, distance to the water source, a robust
307 measurement needed to encompass daily water use and intake at the household and at the
308 individual levels [19]. When focusing on basic water access, the study reveals a percentage of
309 75.3%, lower to what found in Ethiopia in 2022 (88%) [16] and higher than the sub-Saharan
310 Africa 2016 estimates of 74% [17] as well as the 52.4% estimates found in a study in 14 low
311 and middle income countries [20].

312 The presence of HCFs meeting basic handwashing services represents one of the most
313 critical preventive measures against the transmission of infectious diseases [16]. Healthcare

314 associated infections are 2-20 times higher in low- and middle-income countries compared to
315 developed countries and affect between 2-15% of hospital patients [7]. The WHO
316 recommends functional hand hygiene facilities at all critical points of the HCF and due to the
317 COVID-19 pandemics, hand hygiene awareness has gained great momentum worldwide
318 [16,21]. Approximately 48.5% of HCFs in this study had functional handwashing stations
319 both near latrines and at point of care, which was lower than the global target of 80% [6], but
320 twice higher than the percentage found in Ethiopia in 2022 [16]. However, despite this low
321 proportion, hand washing services indicators were significantly improved by the COVID-19
322 pandemics as well as the proportion of HCFs with cleaning protocols available. This could be
323 because during the COVID-19 pandemics, there was a mandatory increase in handwashing
324 stations installation as well as the availability of soap and hydroalcoholic solutions. In this
325 study, only 6% of the staff responsible for cleaning had received any sort of training,
326 highlighting the need for an emphasis to be put on training and education. In fact, as a study
327 in Rwanda reported frequent misuse and/or theft of handwashing facilities [16] and adequate
328 WASH in HCF could set examples for proper hand hygiene behavior to be carried into
329 households and communities [20].

330 Some limitations of this study include the retrospective collection of data that could
331 induce memory bias from the respondents and the small sample size that could preclude the
332 generalizability of the results. Moreover, lack of laboratory analysis of water supply samples
333 may have overestimated the number of HCFs with basic access to water. This study used a
334 tool with 39 validated indicators that could facilitate comprehensive assessment of WASH
335 services in HCFs and hence, through the obtained score, allow the identification of health care
336 centers that require priority in action by the government. More research could be conducted to
337 adapt the indicators by ward or by medical specialty within each HCF and also to extend the
338 use of the WASH-HCF tool to other regions of Cameroon and even of sub-Saharan Africa.

339 **Conclusions**

340 The COVID-19 pandemics was a missed opportunity in the study area to provide sufficient
341 water for patients and health workers, build disability-friendly sanitation facilities, and more
342 handwashing stations at point of care and near latrines. There should be a continuing
343 encouragement of governments and funding agencies in planning and budgeting WASH in
344 healthcare-related research and issues, and enable the maintenance of existing WASH
345 infrastructures in healthcare settings. Especially, acknowledging the low proportion of WASH
346 trained staff, the implementation of a WASH committee in HCF including both health care
347 personnel and community members, may increase national recognition of WASH in HCF and
348 its incorporation into policies and have further-reaching effects of WASH-behavior change at
349 the population level. Despite the global chaos the COVID-19 represents, it taught us basic
350 hygiene rules, low risk management of WASH services, further strengthening healthcare
351 acquired infections prevention.

352

353 **Acknowledgements**

354 The authors are thankful to the health care facilities authorities for participating in the study.

355

356

357

358

359

360

361 **References**

- 362 1. Adams J, Bartram J, Chartier Y. Essential environmental health standards in health care
363 [Internet]. 2008 [cited 22 Dec 2022]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241547239)
364 [detail-redirect/9789241547239](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241547239)
- 365 2. Center for Disease Control. Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) in Healthcare
366 Facilities [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022 [cited 22 Dec
367 2022]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/global/healthcare-](https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/global/healthcare-facilities/overview.html)
368 [facilities/overview.html](https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/global/healthcare-facilities/overview.html)
- 369 3. Organisation mondiale de la Santé. (2021). Les orientations de l’OMS sur les activités
370 intégrées de gestion des antimicrobiens [Internet]. Organisation mondiale de la Santé.
371 2021 [cited 15 Jan 2024]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/342428>
- 372 4. Cronk R, Bartram J. Environmental conditions in health care facilities in low- and middle-
373 income countries: Coverage and inequalities. *Int J Hyg Environ*
374 *Health.*2018;221(3):409-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2018.01.004>
- 375 5. Bijelović S, Grossi V, Shinee E, Schmoll O, Jovanović D, Paunović K, et al. Water,
376 sanitation, and hygiene services in health care facilities in the Autonomous Province of
377 Vojvodina, Serbia. *Journal of Water and Health.* 2021;20(1), 12-22.
378 <https://doi.org/10.2166/wh.2021.063>
- 379 6. Organisation mondiale de la Santé & Fonds des Nations Unies pour l’enfance (UNICEF).
380 Rapport de situation mondial sur les services WASH dans les établissements de santé :
381 Les impératifs premiers [Internet]. Organisation mondiale de la Santé ; 2021 [cited 15 Jan
382 2024]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/349574>

383

- 384 7. Margaret Person, Marissa Vigar, Victoria Trinies, & Robert Quick. (2019). Evaluation of
385 Water, Sanitation, Hygiene, and Environmental Conditions in 27 Healthcare Facilities in
386 Kamwenge District, Uganda [Internet]. 2019 [cited 15 Jan 2024]. Available from:
387 [https://thewashroom.waterforpeople.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/11/WASH-in-](https://thewashroom.waterforpeople.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/11/WASH-in-HCFs-in-Kamwenge-CDC-Evaluation-Follow-up-Report-Nov-2019.pdf)
388 [HCFs-in-Kamwenge-CDC-Evaluation-Follow-up-Report-Nov-2019.pdf](https://thewashroom.waterforpeople.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/11/WASH-in-HCFs-in-Kamwenge-CDC-Evaluation-Follow-up-Report-Nov-2019.pdf)
- 389 8. McGriff JA, Denny L. (2020). What COVID-19 Reveals about the Neglect of WASH
390 within Infection Prevention in Low-Resource Healthcare Facilities. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*
391 *nov 2020;103(5):1762-4.* <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0638>
- 392 9. Ministry of Public Health of Cameroon. Le difficile accès à l'eau potable au Cameroun |
393 TPSF - Travaux Publics Sans Frontières. 2022; Available from
394 [https://www.carenews.com/tpsf-travaux-publics-sans-frontieres/news/le-difficile-acces-a-](https://www.carenews.com/tpsf-travaux-publics-sans-frontieres/news/le-difficile-acces-a-l-eau-potable-au-cameroun)
395 [l-eau-potable-au-cameroun](https://www.carenews.com/tpsf-travaux-publics-sans-frontieres/news/le-difficile-acces-a-l-eau-potable-au-cameroun)
- 396 10. Ateudjieu J, Yakum MN, Goura AP, Nafack SS, Chebe AN, Azakoh JN, et al. Health
397 facility preparedness for cholera outbreak response in four cholera-prone districts in
398 Cameroon : A cross sectional study. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 8 juill 2019;19(1):458.
399 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4315-7>
- 400 11. Forrester JD, Pillai SK, Beer KD, Neatherlin J, Massaquoi M, Nyenswah TG, et al.
401 Assessment of ebola virus disease, health care infrastructure, and preparedness—Four
402 counties, Southeastern Liberia, august 2014. *MMWR. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*
403 2014;63(40), 891-893.
- 404 12. Cochran WG. *Sampling Techniques*. 3rd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1977.
405 [https://www.academia.edu/29684662/Cochran_1977_Sampling_Techniques_Third_Editio](https://www.academia.edu/29684662/Cochran_1977_Sampling_Techniques_Third_Edition)
406 [n](https://www.academia.edu/29684662/Cochran_1977_Sampling_Techniques_Third_Edition)
407

- 408 13. World Health Organization & United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). (2018). Core
409 questions and indicators for monitoring WASH in health care facilities in the Sustainable
410 Development Goals [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2019 [cited 23 Dec
411 2022]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/275783>
- 412 14. Maina M, Tosas-Auguet O, McKnight J, Zosi M, Kimemia G, Mwaniki P, et al.
413 Extending the use of the World Health Organisations’ water sanitation and hygiene
414 assessment tool for surveys in hospitals – from WASH-FIT to WASH-FAST. PLOS ONE.
415 2019; 14(12), e0226548. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0226548>
- 416 15. Weber N, Martinsen AL, Sani A, Assigbley EKE, Azzouz C, Hayter A, et al.
417 Strengthening Healthcare Facilities Through Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH)
418 Improvements : A Pilot Evaluation of “WASH FIT” in Togo. Health Security.
419 2018;16(S1), S-54. <https://doi.org/10.1089/hs.2018.0042>
- 420 16. Berihun G, Adane M, Walle Z, Abebe M, Alemnew Y, Natnael T, et al. Access to and
421 challenges in water, sanitation, and hygiene in healthcare facilities during the early phase
422 of the COVID-19 pandemic in Ethiopia : A mixed-methods evaluation. PLOS ONE.
423 2022;17(5), e0268272. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268272>
- 424 17. Kanyangarara M, Allen S, Jiwani SS, Fuente D. Access to water, sanitation and hygiene
425 services in health facilities in sub-Saharan Africa 2013–2018: Results of health facility
426 surveys and implications for COVID-19 transmission. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021;21(1),
427 601. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06515-z>
- 428 18. Huttinger A, Dreibelbis R, Kayigamba F, Ngabo F, Mfura L, Merryweather B, et al.
429 Water, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure and quality in rural healthcare facilities in
430 Rwanda. BMC Health Services Research. 2017;17(1), 517.
431 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-017-2460-4>
432

- 433 19. Nounkeu CD, Gruber K, Kamgno J, Teta I, Dharod J. Development of water insecurity
434 scale for rural households in Cameroon-Central Africa. *Global Health Action*. 2021;14(1),
435 p.1927328.
- 436 20. Kmentt L, Cronk R, Tidwell JB, Rogers E. Water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) in
437 healthcare facilities of 14 low-and middle-income countries: to what extent is WASH
438 implemented and what are the ‘drivers’ of improvement in their service levels? *H2Open*
439 *Journal*. 2021;4(1), pp.129-137.
- 440 21. Krishnamoorthy Y, M K, Kuberan D, Krishnan M, Tondare D. Compliance with hand
441 hygiene practices and its appropriateness among healthcare workers during COVID-19
442 pandemic in public health facilities of Tamil Nadu, India. *Heliyon*. 2023;9(4), e15410.
443 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e15410>
444